



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

qualities that are not his. No significant loss to the sum total of human happiness ensued upon the publication of Mazzini's dreams and fancies about music and literature, but deep misery was brought upon millions of human beings by his unbalanced and irrational attempts to revolutionize Italy. Universal experience shows us, indeed, that agitators are inevitable, if not indispensable, in political progress. But no experience shows that humanity is more true to itself in eulogizing the fanatical agitator than in praising the sane statesman. In the long run history must revere not John Brown, but Abraham Lincoln, not Giuseppe Mazzini, but Camillo di Cavour.

W. A. D.

The Politics of Aristotle, with an Introduction, two Prefatory Essays and Notes Critical and Explanatory. By W. L. NEWMAN, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1887 and 1902. — Four volumes, xx, 580; lxvii, 418; xlvi, 603; lxx, 708 pp.

In the body of writings that has come down to us under the name of Aristotle a prominent place is held by a work on the state — Πολιτικά — known among English-speaking scholars by the misleading title *The Politics*. From the point of view of subject matter one may describe the work as an account of the birth and growth of the body politic, its perfect form as imagined by the writer, the species of it that occurred in the Greek world, their pathology, and the prophylactics of their characteristic ills. This involves a discussion of the household, a criticism of preceding political theories (particularly Plato's), the exposition of general principles concerning the state, the question of the best form of government, the details of the ideal state (incomplete), the several forms of constitution and their decay, together with practical directions for politicians and statesmen. From the point of view of literature the *Politics* may be described as the result of Aristotle's lectures on the state. That it was published, at least as a whole, during the author's lifetime there is no good reason for thinking. The part dealing with the ideal state has literary finish, but it is incomplete and very likely never was completed.

The *Politics* has come down to us divided into eight books. That this division was made by Aristotle himself is improbable, but the division must be very ancient — seemingly at least as early as the edition of Andronicus of Rhodes in the first century B.C.; for by the division into eight books we must explain the present jumbled order of the text

as a whole, and that order seems to have been already established in the time of Augustus. As early as the fourteenth century it was observed that the present seventh and eighth books should come before the present fourth book, and in the last century it was made plain to many that the sixth book should precede the fifth. The order that is now widely accepted among scholars is 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 4, 6, 5. But this is not the worst. The treatise opens with a sentence which is hopelessly illogical (though the editors are almost marvellously blind to the fact), and the text is disfigured throughout by evident breaks, dislocations of small sections, and interpolations. How all this came about is a question that has occupied much of the attention of Aristotelian scholars but can perhaps never be fully solved. A posthumous edition by pupils of an imperfectly arranged and incomplete mass of the master's manuscript is perhaps the simplest general solution.

By one of the curious fates of books our earliest text of the *Politics* as a whole is not in Greek. Save for a few fragments, the earliest Greek MSS. are of the fourteenth century; but about the year 1260, as it would appear, a Flemish Dominican, William of Moerbeke, put forth a translation of the *Politics* into bad Latin — a translation which, according to his light, was very faithful and literal. William — who, as a not unworthy reward for his study of Greek at a time when its voice was somewhat more than faint in Western Europe, became archbishop of Corinth — seems to have used a Greek manuscript of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. His translation (the so-called *vetusta translatio* or *vetus versio*) has, therefore, approximately the value of a manuscript of that date. It is one of the merits of that distinguished Aristotelian scholar of the last century, Franz Susemihl, that in his edition of the *Politics* published in 1872 (the first of his three editions) he published a critical text of William's translation and thus brought it into due prominence.

Some twenty years ago Mr. W. L. Newman — following largely in the footsteps of Susemihl, from whom, as he tells us (vol. iii, p. iii), he "first learnt what the close study of a work of Aristotle's really meant" — undertook to edit the *Politics* with an English commentary. The first volume, made up of a vast introduction, and the second volume, containing the first two books of the *Politics* with commentary, appeared in 1887; but the other two volumes of the huge edition were not published till 1902. In considering the finished work we must, therefore, deal to some extent with what has been before the public for a number of years.

As in the case of other classical works, the task of an editor and commentator of the *Politics* is a composite one. He must determine as nearly as may be the original words of the author and he must explain those words, wherever they seem to require explanation, from the point of view of language and style, as well as from that of subject matter. Furthermore, he should analyze the work. In the case of the *Politics*, a writing of so great importance for students of history and political theory and practice, the editor should be familiar with subjects not always necessary to the philologist. Thus Mr. Newman's task was a very large one and difficult for any man to accomplish equally well throughout. We shall, therefore, be ready to treat with leniency defects in his edition. The fact that Mr. Newman's habit of mind is that of the student of history and literature rather than that of the philologist in the narrower sense should move the verbal critic to real admiration when he examines his labors upon the text. Mr. Newman is a good classical scholar, but he is no Bentley or Porson, to say the least. However, he sifts the evidence for the text of the *Politics* (including the *vetus versio* to the study of which he makes contributions in vol. ii, pp. xli-lxvii, and in vol. iii, pp. vii-xxv) with learning, intelligence and independence of judgment. That he committed himself at the start to the order of books 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 4, 5, 6, we may regret — the more so perhaps for the misgiving that he seems to feel in the fourth volume (pp. 149 *et seq.*) — but his discussion of the arrangement of the work is careful and valuable.

It is a pity too, that the text is printed as it is. The present writer has no liking in general for editions in which a thin black line of Greek is placed on the page above a strip of critical notes, and that in its turn above a mass of more or less pertinent exegesis; but surely — especially in the case of such a text as that of the *Politics* — not only should diacritical marks be used pretty freely and according to an easily intelligible system in the text, but also the critical notes should stand on the same page with the text and not be put into a limbo between it and the commentary, as in the present edition.

Mr. Newman's English style is admirable; clear, dignified, elegant and calm, it reflects a scholarly, cultivated and unpedantic mind; but for all that the huge introduction is not easy reading. It is too discursive; there are too many side-lights, too many instances ancient and modern. Surely it would have been far better, had a very careful and precise analysis of the contents of the *Politics* been presented, and had all special points, of a nature to require more extended treatment than can well be given in a rightly proportioned commentary, been

relegated to separate short chapters or appendices. The work of the editor, while thus losing in apparent unity, would have gained much in real unity and in usefulness to the reader. The defects that have been indicated cannot be obviated by marginal analysis and full indices alone.

What has been said above about ancient and modern instances in the Introduction applies also to the commentary. There is here, as in the Introduction, much that is of great value to the student of the subject matter of the *Politics*; but there are those that would gladly dispense with anecdotes about President Buchanan and other more or less famous statesmen, and with a good deal else that has the air of being extracted from scrap-books, in order that either bulk might be lessened or space gained for matters possibly more vital.

Another matter that perhaps calls for attention here, and that might be emphasized by an editor, is the general thought and habit of mind of Aristotle as displayed in the *Politics*. That a philosopher considering the state, at the time when Alexander was carrying a flood of Hellenism into the East, should consider it from the point of view of the small city-state of the Greek world and practically from that point of view alone, argues a mind of considerable limitations. As a collector of material for scientific investigation, as a systematizer, as a terminologist, and, perhaps, in a smaller degree, as a critic, Aristotle possessed great ability; but he lacked the imaginative power of Plato and even Isocrates's vision of the mission of the Greek race. His lack of original genius on the one hand and his critical spirit on the other caused him to build upon Plato's foundation more perhaps than he knew; but it made him at the same time a carping critic of his master.

Students both of political science and of Greek literature, philosophy and philology will find much of value in Mr. Newman's stately volumes. If he has not produced the final English edition of Aristotle's *Politics*, he has yet labored well and placed scholars in his debt. The reviewer may be pardoned for expressing in conclusion the pious wish that one of his own countrymen might do even nearly as much as Mr. Newman has done for any portion of the writings of "*il maestro di color' che sanno*."

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.